

REMARKS

Drawing Amendments

In the Action of January 14, 2011, the Examiner objected to the drawings because in FIGS. 1-16 contained small size fonts impacting legibility. Sixteen replacement sheets including FIGS. 1-16 (left unchanged) are being enclosed with the present response. These sixteen sheet replaces the original sheets 1-8 including FIGS. 1-16.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's objection to the drawings of FIGS. 1-16 are overcome by the replacement sheets

Specification Amendments

In the Action of January 14, 2011, the Examiner objects to the abstract of the specification due to its length of more than 150 words and the use of legal phraseology such as comprising. In addition, the Examiner requests the referenced application serial number and filing date be updated in the section "Cross Reference to Related Applications." The Applicant has amended the Abstract and paragraph [0001] in the section "Cross Reference to Related Applications" of the specification, as required by the Examiner. In addition, paragraph [0038] of the specification has also been amended to update the referenced application serial number.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's objections to the specification have been overcome.

Claim Amendments

Claims 11-13 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-10 and 14-16 are previously withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Claim 11 has been amended to remove indefinite terms and to more particularly point out the Applicant's invention. Claims 12-13 remain unchanged. Claims 1-10 and 14-16 are canceled. Claims 17-20 are new.

Support for new claim 17, reciting "*wherein the functionally equivalent circuits are digital circuits*" can be found, for example, at paragraph [0023] of the present disclosure.

Support for new claim 18 reciting "*wherein the multi-bit numbers are parameters selected from the group consisting of voltage parameter, pressure parameter, load parameter, current parameter, and frequency parameter*" can be found, for example, at paragraph [0048] of the present disclosure.

Support for new claim 19 reciting "*wherein the small manufacturing tolerance related-differences between particular instantiations of the functionally equivalent circuits are chip-to-chip variations and within-chip variations*" can be found, for example, at paragraph [0027] of the present disclosure.

Support for new claim 20 reciting "*wherein the expressing and the testing is conducted at a controlled temperature*" can be found, for example, at paragraph [0045] of the present disclosure.

35 USC § 112, second paragraph

In the Action of January 14, 2011, the Examiner rejects claims 11-13 under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite due to the presence of the terms "representing", "as a", "particular item", "thereafter", and "last mentioned" in claim 11, and claims 12-13 are rejected as being directed to claim 11. The Applicant has amended claim 11 to remove the indefinite terms as required by the Examiner, and submits that the amended claim 11 overcomes the rejection of indefiniteness. The Applicant also submits that rejections to claims 12-13 are also overcome at least due to their direct dependence on the amended claim 11.

35 USC § 102(b)

In the Action of January 14, 2011, the Examiner rejects claims 11-13 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cho et al. (US 5,638,381) [hereafter referred to as Cho]. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant notes that the Examiner's rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 USC § 102(b) in the Action is non-compliant under MPEP 2143.03 which recites under the subtitle of "ALL CLAIM LIMITATIONS MUST BE CONSIDERED" that:

All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.

The Applicant submits that the Examiner makes no mention of the **words** of claim 11 of the present disclosure in the anticipation rejection. For example, claim 11 recites "*expressing small manufacturing tolerance related-differences between particular instantiations of the functionally equivalent circuits in terms of a plurality of multi-bit numbers*", "*installing said particular instantiation of said functionally equivalent circuits in an item of equipment*", and "*testing said item of equipment for a presence of said particular instantiation of said functionally equivalent circuits in said item of equipment by determining said multi-bit numbers*". The Applicant notes that none of the features of "*expressing small manufacturing tolerance related-differences*", "*installing ... in an item of equipment*", or "*testing said item of equipment*" from claim 11 of the present disclosure are mentioned by the Examiner in the Action.

With all due respect, Applicant submits that the Examiner has made a mistake by reciting the words from claim 11 **from the prior art of Cho** instead of the present disclosure in the Action, and noting that claim 11 of **Cho** reads on Figure 2 of Cho.

Further, the Applicant notes that the Examiner's rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 USC § 102(b) in the Action is non-compliant under 37 CFR 1.104 (c)(2), which recites:

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. . . The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified. (underline added for emphasis)

The Applicant requests that the Examiner please identify where Cho discloses features of each of claims 11-13 of the present application. For example, claim 12 recites "*wherein said instantiations of functionally equivalent circuits each comprise a separate instantiation of an integrated circuit device*" and claim 13 recites "*wherein each multi-bit number is associated with a gate or a group of gates, said gate or group of gates being functionally configured by an analog control or configuration signal generated by a DAC*" which are not mentioned by the Examiner in the Action.

Based on the above paragraphs, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has not presented a compliant rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 USC § 102(b). Based on the Action of January 14, 2011, Applicant does not understand how the reference of Cho is applied to the rejection of claims 11-13 and thus cannot respond to the rejection of claims 11-13 as require.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection or clearly identify where Cho or another reference discloses features of claims 11-13 of the present application in a further non-final action.

Conclusions

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Applicant believes that no fees are due in connection with the submission of the present paper, However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 50-4194. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection herewith may be charged to deposit account no. 50-4194.

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being electronically transmitted on

April 11, 2011
(date of deposit)

/Richard Yo/
(signature of person transmitting)

Respectfully submitted,

/Alessandro Steinfl Reg. No. 56,448/

Alessandro Steinfl
Reg. No. 56,448

STEINFL & BRUNO
301 N Lake Ave Ste 810
Pasadena, CA 91101
Telephone: (626)792-0536
Fax: (626)792-1342